REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **January 14, 2005** the Examiner reviewed Claims 1-17. Independent claims 1, 8, and 13 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Santhanam (USPN 5,704,053, hereinafter "Santhanam").

Objections to the claims

Independent claims 1, 8, and 13 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 1, 8, and 13 were marked as "Original claim" rather than –Currently amended--.

Applicant apologizes for the incorrect markings. The claims now carry the correct markings.

Additionally, independent claims 1, 8, and 15 contain the language "some (but not necessarily all)" rather than "some but not necessarily all."

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to remove the parentheses.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-17 were rejected as being anticipated by Santhanam.

Applicant respectfully points out that Santhanam teaches away from the present invention. Specifically, Santhanam teaches allowing only a **single prefetch** for a given cache line (see Santhanam, col. 6, line 54 to col. 7, line 8).

In contrast, the present invention inserts **multiple prefetch instructions** for a given cache line (see FIG. 7 and page 16, line 5 to page 17, line 6 of the instant application). This is advantageous because it insures that a given cache line will be prefetched even if some of the prefetch instructions get dropped by the underlying hardware. There is nothing within Santhanam, either explicit or

implicit, which suggests inserting multiple prefetch instructions for a given cache line.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 13 to clarify that the present invention inserts multiple prefetch instructions for a given cache line. These amendments find support in FIG. 7 and in page 16, line 5 to page 17, line 6 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 13 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 9-12, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 14-17, which depend upon claim 13, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: February 7, 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-2914
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665